

MSDI Transportation Framework Working Group
Minutes for meeting of 10 February, 2011
2:30-3:30pm

Attendees

- Ken Wall, Lance Clampitt, Mike Sweet, Dylan Berg, Mindy Cochran, Nate Holm, Scott Story, Eric Sivers, Gerry Daumiller, Erin Geraghty, Meghan Burns, Michael Fashoway, Jens Bolstad, Duane Lund, Craig Jones, Annette Cabrera, Janelle Luppen, Joshua Dorris

Framework status update and future goals/enhancements

- Presented on current status completing MLIA FY11 grant deliverables
- Overview of future framework goals for FY12

Comments/suggestions from stakeholders

- Question about what determines the authoritative source when two providers submit datasets with roads of coincident geometry that extends into an adjacent jurisdiction. Generally, only provider's roads within its jurisdiction get used in the framework. But there are exceptions such as when a county road with related address ranges extends into a national forest to access private inholdings. If the county road has addresses and fairly represents the geometry, then that segment may be integrated into the forest.
- Comment that's it a good venture the BMSC will be working with staff from the UofM, College of Forestry and Conservation, on a pilot project developing and implementing editing protocol for USFS roads in the Lolo NF. This will benefit and add value to the Framework as new Lolo roads get loaded that have satisfied the BMSC/FS QA/QC.
- Question regarding Mineral County has mapped and networked all FS roads within its border and has the BMSC got the roads from them? The BMSC has not recently received roads from Mineral County.
- Question about whether the Framework contains railroad mile markers. Presently, the framework does not contain any mile makers and the theme lead will contact MDT to ascertain if they are available. If they are, they will be incorporated into the framework.
- Question asking if a comparison has been done between the Transportation Framework roads and the 2010 US Census lines? And quality of data? A few areas were briefly reviewed but not enough to render any conclusion on quality.
- Comment that in one county the geometry of about half the railroads features is bad. We will work with the stakeholder to review and accurately represent railroads in the respective area.
- Question asking if an attribute designating "maintenance" of roads will be incorporated into the framework. We are working with data providers and will propose to them to include that information with new data submissions.
- Question if there are established "agreement points" along the state border, which are points along roads agreed to between jurisdictions where one's road linework stops and the adjacent roads begin. There currently are no agreement points between adjacent states, but there is a points layer being developed between counties as new data gets

loaded. The steward will explore establishing points between MT and surrounding states.

- Question if there are plans to add more data to the “surface types” and “number of lanes” attributes, as these are critical to workflow. The Road Attributes table contains these fields and if that data was received by the provider, then it’s in the table. The theme steward will work with data providers that don’t carry those fields and provide encouragement to do so.
- Comment regarding metadata asking for elaboration on attribute descriptions. The descriptions will be enriched in the next published model.
- Question requesting the number of records in the Address Ranges table in the current Framework. In the next framework release, the number of address ranges will match the number of road segments. Currently, there are 273285 records in the table.
- Question if NAVTECH gets data from the Framework. NAVTECH has communicated with the framework steward about model updates and indicated they download it to update base maps as changes warrant.
- Question asking if white spaces in the road names field will be removed. Null spaces are currently being removed from the field for the next published framework version.
- Comment suggesting post a map at the framework website showing status of data-sharing agreements (MOU) with providers, which may help influence other counties to get on board. This is a good idea and will be developed for posting.